



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 20, 2021

Mr. Uriel Tuck
Assistant General Counsel
Harris County District Attorneys Office
500 Jefferson Street, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2021-22771

Dear Mr. Tuck:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 901998 (HCDA Tracking # 2021.05-0065).

The Harris County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we must address the obligations of the district attorney's office under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedural obligations that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b).

¹ Although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege in this instance are sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively. *See* Open Records Decision Nos 676 at 1-2 (2002), 677 (2002).

² We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

You inform us the district attorney's office received the request for information on May 26, 2021. Accordingly, the ten-business-day deadline was June 10, 2021. However, the envelope in which the district attorney's office provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked June 11, 2021. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the district attorney's office failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, we find you failed to establish a compelling reason to address these claims. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information at issue.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication." *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally

excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the submitted information consists of communications with the general counsel for the district attorney's office and district attorney's office attorneys that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district attorney's office. You further state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Joseph Hoggatt
Attorney
Open Records Division

JWH/jm

Ref: ID# 901998

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.